

From: ["Young, Howard S." <younghs@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:younghs@cdmsmith.com)
To: ["Sheldrake, Sean" <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>](mailto:sheldrake.sean@epa.gov)
["Zhen, Davis" <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>](mailto:Zhen.Davis@epa.gov)
CC: ["Scott Coffey" <coffeyse@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:coffeyse@cdmsmith.com)
["Trump, Julee M." <trumpjm@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:trumpjm@cdmsmith.com)
Date: 4/16/2018 6:20:01 PM
Subject: FW: Sheen/characterization
Attachments: [20180416_163307.jpg](#)

Sean and Davis,

We would like to get direction on what EPA considers significant sheen or visual contamination in the sediment grabs collected during the surface sediment sampling. The FSP for the sediment sampling states that sediment or water from the power grab sampler with significant sheen should be contained and characterized for disposal onshore. During today's oversight, Julee has started observing sediment with traces of petroleum hydrocarbon sheen (see attached photograph) that are not being considered a significant sheen or sediment being contained for disposal. Do you have any direction on what EPA considers a significant sheen or contamination requiring containerizing? Certainly, power grabs that result in a sheen to the river during sample retrieval would be considered significant and IDW containerized with BMPs implemented to control sheens to the river. This will become more of an issue as the sampling gets closer to the Gasco site.

Thank you,
Howard

Howard S. Young, LG | CDM Smith
14432 SE Eastgate Way, Suite 100 | Bellevue, WA 98007-6493
T: 425.519.8300 | Direct 425.519.8351 | Cell 206.491.4663 | younghs@cdmsmith.com
[com<mailto:younghs@cdmsmith.com>](mailto:younghs@cdmsmith.com) | [www.cdmsmith.com<http://www.cdmsmith.com>](http://www.cdmsmith.com)